



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/673,322

09/30/2003

Christopher van Es

19111.0124

2243

68009

7590

04/25/2008

Hanify & King, P.C.

1875 K Street

Suite 707

WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

YUAN, KATHLEEN S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/25/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,322	Applicant(s) ES, CHRISTOPHER VAN	
	Examiner KATHLEEN S. YUAN	Art Unit 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The response received on 3/13/2008 has been placed in the file and was considered by the examiner. An action on the merit follows.

Summary of Arguments and Examiner's Response:

1. The applicant has argued that Swonger does not disclose the claimed invention:

"The portion of Swonger cited by the Examiner (col. 2, line 11), refers to what data or areas are accessible to a user. Along these lines, Swonger discloses that access to data or a specific area can be determined based on a particular time period of access.

In other words 'a specific area, for example, may be accessible to a person only between the hours of 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.' The disclosure of Swonger contrasts with the recitations of independent claims 1 and 14 of the present invention. That is, claims 1 and 14 specifically recite that one step determines whether each of the plurality of parts of the user's body are placed on the biometric contact sensor at a sensing position within a predetermined period of time. Swonger makes no mention of such a feature. Instead, Swonger discloses allowing access to an area during a particular time period of access."

2. The rejection still stands. The rejection relies on Lin and Swonger together. The claims require "determining whether each of the plurality of parts are placed...within a predetermined period of time" and issuing an authentication signal...if the parts...are placed...within the predetermined time." As disclosed in the previous rejection, Lin discloses placing the parts in order for authentication. Swonger teaches that there is a

Art Unit: 2624

predetermined period of time during authentication where a user is authorized to access an area. Therefore, Swonger teaches that if the authentication occurs within a predetermined period of time, i.e. 9 a.m. to 5p.m., the user is issued an authentication signal (given a match, of course). Swonger does not contrast the applicant's claimed invention, but teaches it exactly with the combination of Lin. Perhaps the applicant is arguing that the predetermined period of time is akin to a time out signal. If this is what the applicant intends to claim, the applicant must clearly claim this feature in the claim language. However, the examiner warns the applicant that this feature is known, as cited in the previous action, the time out features is known and disclosed by McClurg et al.

Specification

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.

- (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9, 9, 11 and 14- 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6393139 (Lin et al) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4210899 (Swonger).
3. Regarding claim 7, Lin et al discloses an apparatus for authenticating a user (a security system (title), the apparatus comprising a fingerprint sensor, that which enters the fingerprint in step 640 of fig. 5, operable of sensing only one fingerprint at a time, since only one fingerprint is entered at a time in a sequence (col. 2, lines 20-23), and a processor, that which carries the process of fig. 5, and a database, the application access tables that are stored in an enrollment process (fig. 2) adapted to perform a

method of a. placing, in sequence, each of a plurality of parts of the user's body on a biometric sensor, as explained above, at a sensing position, any position which allows for the entering of the fingerprint (col. 6, lines 18-20); b. obtaining from the sensor a data set of biometric contact characteristics for each of the plurality of body parts, the data set being the fingerprint parameters (col. 6, lines col. 6, lines 21-25); c. comparing each data set with authentic versions stored in a database, the authentic versions being the parameter of the fingerprint in the corresponding position of the fingerprint entering sequences stored in the table (col. 6, lines 21-27); and, d. issuing an authentication signal if the data sets satisfactorily match the corresponding authentic versions by signaling the allowance access to the application (col. 6, lines 30-34).

Although Lin et al discloses that a CCD sensor can be used as the biometric sensor (col. 1, lines 30-50), Lin et al does not disclose expressly that the biometric sensor is a contact sensor. Furthermore, Lin et al does not disclose expressly that there is a determining whether each of the plurality of parts of the user's body are placed on the sensor at a sensing position within a predetermined period of time and authenticating if the parts are placed within the predetermined period of time.

Swonger discloses that the sensor is a contact sensor since the finger is in contact with the sensor (fig. 3, item 111a). Furthermore, Swonger et al discloses this feature, where certain time limit of access for authentication (col. 2, line 11), thus it is determined whether each of the plurality of parts of the user's body are placed on the sensor within the predetermined time of access, since Lin teaches that the plurality of

parts are placed for authentication, and only issuing an authentication signal if it is within that predetermined period of time.

Lin et al and Swonger are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. fingerprint image processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have the finger in contact with the sensor and to use a predetermined time period.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the best representation of the fingerprint and thus a more accurate match/recognition by providing a simple way to obtain a focused image and to provide a more secure system by providing access to only those who are authorized.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the apparatus of Lin et al with the contact sensor of and period of access as disclosed by Swonger to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

4. Claim 1 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7. Thus, the arguments analogous to that presented above for claim 7 are equally applicable to claim 1. Claim 1 distinguishes from claim 7 only in that claim 1 is a methods claim and claim 7 is an apparatus. An apparatus carries out a method, therefore, prior art applies.

5. Regarding claim 2, Lin et al discloses that the body parts are the user's fingertips (Lin et al, fig. 1) and the biometric sensor is a fingerprint sensor since the sensor is sensing fingerprints.

6. Regarding claim 3, Swonger discloses a certain time limit of access (col. 2, line 11), thus any part of the user's body must be placed on the sensor, part of the identification process, within that predetermined time period, and the individual will gain access, thus getting the signal that they were authenticated.

7. Regarding claim 4, Lin et al discloses the step of confirming that the sequence of data sets was obtained in a predetermined order before issuing the authentication signal (col. 6, lines 18-21 and col. 5, lines 18-22).

8. Regarding claim 5, Lin et al discloses data sets are compared with the authentic versions using a minutiae based algorithm (col. 6, line 23).

9. Regarding claim 6, Lin et al discloses the data sets are compared with the authentic versions using a correlation based algorithm, since the data set/parameter of the fingerprint is correlated to the parameter from the table to see if the fingerprint matches sufficiently to be in the corresponding position (col. 6, lines 23-30).

10. Regarding claim 8, Lin et al discloses that many fingerprint sensors are capacitive sensors (col. 1, lines 35-43).

11. Regarding claim 9, Lin et al discloses that many fingerprint sensors are optical sensors (col. 1, line 19). Swonger also uses an optical sensor (col. 13, lines 20-24).

12. Regarding claim 11, Lin et al further discloses a data input device, the device in which the user enters his or her User ID (col. 6, lines 9-10).

13. Regarding claim 14, Lin et al discloses a method of authenticating the identity of a user (fig. 5), the method comprising: a. obtaining a sequence of data sets of biometric characteristics, or fingerprints, of the user, the sequence being the sequence of

fingerprints and each data set being each fingerprint (col. 6, lines 18-21), each data set relating to one of a plurality of parts of the user's body, a different finger of the user's body (fig. 1 and 2); b. comparing each data set with authentic versions stored in a database, the authentic versions of the database being the parameters stored in a record in the application access table (col. 6, lines 14-15,23-27); c. monitoring the order in which the sequence of data sets was obtained (col. 5, lines 18-22), since the order must match the order stored; and, d. issuing an authentication signal if the data sets satisfactorily match the corresponding authentic versions and the sequence of data sets was obtained in a predetermined order, the authentication signal being the signal of allowing access to the user (col. 6, lines 30-34).

Lin et al does not disclose expressly determining whether the sequence of data sets is obtained within a predetermined period of time and authenticating if the sequence of data sets was obtained within the predetermined period of time.

Swonger discloses that the sensor is a contact sensor since the finger is in contact with the sensor (fig. 3, item 111a). Furthermore, Swonger et al discloses this feature, where certain time limit of access for authentication (col. 2, line 11), thus it is determined whether each of the plurality of parts of the user's body are placed on the sensor within the predetermined time of access, since Lin teaches that the plurality of parts are placed for authentication, and only issuing an authentication signal if it is within that predetermined period of time.

Lin et al and Swonger are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. fingerprint processing.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have a time out function.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more secure system by providing access to only those who are authorized.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the authentication method of Lin et al with the times of access of Swonger to obtain the invention as specified in claim 14.

14. Regarding claim 15, Lin et al discloses at least one of the plurality of parts of the user's body is a fingertip (fig. 1).

15. Regarding claim 17, Lin et al discloses at least one of the plurality of parts of the user's body is the user's face (col. 5, lines 28-31).

16. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al in view of Swonger as applied to claim 7 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5864296 (Upton).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) discloses all of the claimed elements as set forth above and incorporated herein by reference.

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) does not disclose expressly the fingerprint sensor is a thermal sensor.

Upton discloses that many fingerprint sensors are thermal (col. 1, lines 35-36).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) and Upton are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. fingerprint recognition.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use a thermal sensor.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more flexible system by providing a different ways of sensing the fingerprint, such as imaging fingerprints in the dark.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the apparatus of Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) with the thermal sensor of Upton to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

17. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al in view of Swonger as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5594806 (Colbert).

Regarding claim 12, Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) discloses all of the claimed elements as set forth above and incorporated herein by reference.

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) does not disclose expressly the data input device is a keypad.

Colbert discloses a data input device is a keypad (col. 6, line 58).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) and Colbert are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. verification systems.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide an input keypad.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more accurate/user-friendly system by allowing the user to access data and indicated information by providing a simple means to indicate the user's preferences.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the apparatus of Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) with the keypad of Colbert to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

18. Regarding claim 13, Colbert discloses a data input device being a smart card reader (col. 7, lines 56-57), so that a templates/database can be stored on the smartcard instead of on a large database, thus reducing memory requirements of the system.

19. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin et al in view Swonger, as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4109237 (Hill).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) discloses all of the claimed elements as set forth above and incorporated herein by reference. Lin et al further discloses that one of the parts of the body can be the iris, a part of the eye (col. 5, line 31).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) does not disclose expressly that the user's body part is a retina.

Hill discloses another means of identifying individuals with the eye, the retina (title).

Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) and Hill are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, i.e. individual identification using biometrics.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the retina as one of the parts.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a more accurate/secure system by providing additional elements that must be identified.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine the method Lin et al (as modified by Swonger) with the identification of the retina as disclosed by Hill to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Conclusion

20. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 7203344 (McClurg et al) provides another interpretation of the "predetermined time period" as timing out operations, as shown in fig. 6.

21. This is a request for continuation. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2624

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KATHLEEN S. YUAN whose telephone number is (571)272-2902. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursdays, 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh Mehta can be reached on (571)272-7453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Bhavesh M Mehta/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624

KY

Application/Control Number: 10/673,322
Art Unit: 2624

Page 14

4/15/2008